Remarks

This is in response to the Office Action having a date of mailing of November 28, 2005. This response is timely if submitted on March 28, 2006, along with a petition for a one month extension of time, certificate of mailing, and requisite fee, which are submitted herewith.

Regarding the rejection of the independent claims for anticipation by Jordan, this is respectfully traversed and no amendment is needed as will now be explained. The present invention relates to a method of mapping a packet orientated client signal to a synchronous network payload. Claim 1 specifies:

> "processing said client signal to a form suitable for mapping to said payload which preserves a buffer-to-buffer flow control mechanism of the client signal, wherein said step of processing reduces the bandwidth of the client signal while maintaining the integrity of a payload of the client signal".

An aim of this processing is to enable more efficient transmission of packet oriented protocols which can use a buffer-to-buffer flow control mechanism, such as Fibre Channel and ESCON, through a synchronous network. Such a flow control mechanism helps to ensure that the buffers of receiving and transmitting ports along a particular communications path do not overflow, which could cause data to be lost and/or retransmitted. Notably the buffers of the buffer-buffer mechanism referred to in the claim are buffers controlled by the mechanism of the client signal.

The Examiner tries to show that Jordan shows this feature and cites col 4 line 48. But this passage is concerned with a different feature. Jordan is concerned generally with converting a conventional data packet received from a 1 Gb Ethernet network to a conventional data packet suitable for transmitting on a conventional standard bandwidth synchronous SONET network such as an OCnc (n=1, 3, 12) payload network with no loss of data content. This is achieved by receiving a series

packet bursts from a broadband network with idle bytes interposed between the bursts; removing the idle bytes to reduce a transmitted bit stream, framing the packets in accordance with a conventional protocol such as a General Frame Protocol (GFP) or Packet Over Sonet protocol (POS), and providing the framed data packets to the synchronous payload network.

The cited passage of Jordan is only a conventional buffer overflow control. It is not concerned with a buffer-buffer mechanism, since there is only one buffer, and no buffer at the sending side. Furthermore, it is not concerned with a flow control mechanism of the client signal, since the client signal is not involved in the buffer overflow. This converter buffer of Jordan is not visible to or controlled by the client signal. Instead this passage of Jordan is only concerned with a mechanism for stopping sending from a source if a buffer at the converter becomes filled.

The cited passage states that:

> "Since the gate keeping signal provided by control logic block 120 corresponds to the 1 Gb clock rate of the Ethernet network and is therefore faster than the signal provided by OCnc payload clock 130, the rate at which data is written to buffer 116 can be faster than the rate at which data is read from buffer 116. Thus, and in order to prevent a buffer overflow, the values of read pointer 122 and write pointer 124 are provided to register 126 to regulate enabling the gate keeping signal of control logic block 120. A conventional pulse command (not shown) can also be returned to the Ethernet network instruction it to stop sending data. Thus, buffer 116 absorbs the differential between the write rate from the Ethernet network 50 and the read rate to the OCnc payload network 60."

Hence there is no disclosure in Jordan of the claim feature of a buffer-buffer flow control mechanism of the client signal. Hence there can not be any disclosure of the claim feature of:

"processing said client signal to a form suitable for mapping to said payload which preserves a buffer-to-buffer flow control mechanism of the client signal..."
Hence claim 1 is not anticipated. As Jordan relates only to Ethernet and not to a protocol such as Fiberchannel or ESCON, which has a buffer-buffer flow control mechanism, there is nothing in Jordan leading a skilled person to adapt it to reach the claimed invention. None of the other cited documents are more relevant, and hence claim 1 is not obvious over Jordan or any combination of documents.
Independent claim 16 has corresponding distinctive features of removing part of the client signal, preserving the buffer-to-buffer flow control mechanism of the client signal and maintaining the integrity of the payload of the client signal. Hence it is acceptable for the same reasons.

Independent claim 20 is directed to a corresponding method of restoring a client signal by adding an ordered set while preserving the buffer-to-buffer flow control mechanism of the client signal and maintaining the integrity of the payload of the client signal. Hence this is acceptable for the same reasons.
Independent claim 24 has corresponding distinctive features of removing part of the client signal, preserving the buffer-to-buffer flow control mechanism of the client signal and maintaining the integrity of the payload of the client signal. Hence it is acceptable for the same reasons.

Independent claim 30 has corresponding distinctive features of reducing a bandwidth of the client signal, preserving the buffer-to-buffer flow control mechanism of the client signal and maintaining the integrity of the payload of the client signal. Hence it is acceptable for the same reasons.

Independent claim 36 has corresponding distinctive features of removing redundant information from the packet oriented signal while maintaining the integrity of a payload of the packet oriented signal. Hence it is acceptable for the same reasons.

Other claims are dependent on an acceptable main claim and so are acceptable themselves. Accordingly all the points raised have been dealt with, all the claims are acceptable and reconsideration is requested.

March 28, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

Peter J. Shakula
Registration No. 40,808
Barnes & Thornburg LLP
P.O. Box 2786
Chicago, Illinois 60690-2786
(312) 214-4813
(312) 759-5646 (fax)

CHDS01 WLEE 325412v1